Generalized Transformation Design: metrics, speeds, and diffusion

Paul Kinsler* and Martin W. McCall
Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom.
(Dated: Monday 26th October, 2015)

We show that a unified and maximally generalized approach to spatial transformation design is possible, one that encompasses all second order waves, rays, or diffusion processes in anisotropic media. At the design step it is *not* necessary to specify the physical process for which a specific device will be – or is intended to be – built. The primary approximation required is that the effect of wave impedance is neglected, an attribute that plays no role in ray propagation, and therefore is not relevant for pure ray devices; another constraint is that spatial variation in material parameters may need to be sufficiently small. Device construction relies on how we can re-imagine the abstract mathematical notion of a metric on a manifold as a speed-squared matrix (or a diffusion matrix), a step which also specifies the means by which transformation devices will actually be built. Notably, we can conclude that a generalised ray theory that allows for anisotropic indexes (speeds) generates the same predictions as does a wave theory, and the results are closely related to those for diffusion processes.

PACS numbers: 42.25.Bs, 41.20.Jb, 43.20.g, 44.10.+i, 81.05.Zx

arXiv:1510.06890v1 [physics.class-ph] 23 Oct 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of electromagnetic cloaking has now been with us for almost ten years [1, 2], but has been recently revitalized by the introduction of the concept of space-time cloaking [3, 4] and its variety of implementations [5–8] In light of the many variants of spatial cloaking, and of applications in acoustics [9, 10] and diffusion of heat or light [11, 12], it is worth considering how to combine these different applications and approaches into a unified "Transformation Design" (T-Design) scheme, at least to the extent possible. Some progress has been made in that regard, but with a firm focus on wave mechanics expressed in a first-order form [13].

Here we take an exclusively second order approach to the situation. Although less detailed than the first-order approach, notably in the way it does not recognise impedance at all, it has some significant advantages. In any case, when it comes to actual devices – *Transformation devices* (T-devices) – often impedances are ruthlessly ignored or rescaled to suit the technological demands of the programme; thus an interest in impedance could be considered – to some extent – somewhat over careful. T-devices that cannot (or do not) attempt to control scattering or reflections from impedance mismatches have a performance left hostage to the physics of the wave or ray they attempt to manipulate. Notably, we expect that in principle electromagnetic (EM) T-devices are less imperfect than acoustic ones [13].

Here we start by taking the simplest scalar Helmholtz equation as describing our wave system, and see how it can be easily modified to allow for anisotropy. Since, to a great degree, any wave type can be sufficiently well modelled – in appropriate limits – by the Helmholtz equation, this is not a particularly stringent restriction. By a simple and straightforward recasting of the mathematics, we show how it can be put into a form dependent on a metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$; at which point we can apply the concept of transformation design as a mathematical morphism between a reference or "design" solution and a T-device application; the extraction of material parameters from the morphed/transformed metric – for whatever physical system is of interest – is then solely a problem of calculation.

In section II we present the basic wave, ray, and diffusion machinery, and how the material properties map onto the effective metric in the form of a speed-squared matrix, in section III we show how the metric morphs under transformation, and in section IV we give examples. Finally, in section V we summarize our results.

II. WAVES, RAYS, AND DIFFUSIONS

In what follows we will generalise on the common Helmholtz equation approach for T-Design to allow for anisotropy of the propagation in the simplest possible way. We then demonstrate how this generalization allows a unified process for designing T-devices for almost any sort of wave, ray, or diffusion. This is because all these types of processes can have their mathematical expression and behaviour mapped onto the metric seen by the process, so that a transmorphation of a metric is sufficent to determine the necessary material parameters for the chosen T-device.

A. Waves

The most general type of second order wave model is given by the covariant wave equation on a manifold where the spatial part of the metric g_{ij} has its inverse counterpart g^{ij}. In indexed notation using the Einstein summation convention, with greek indices spanning $\{t,x,y,x\}$, latin ones spanning $\{x,y,z\}$, and treating the time coordinate t separately from space, this is

$$\psi^{;\mu}{}_{;\mu} = \nabla_i g^{ij} \nabla_j \psi + g^{tt} \partial_t^2 \psi = 0. \tag{2.1}$$

We justify this space vs time split by considering a particular Lorentz frame in spacetimes with $g_{it} = 0$ (so that $g^{it} = 0$

*Electronic address: Dr.Paul.Kinsler@physics.org

also) and a fixed g_{tt} (and hence fixed g^{tt}). Here both "$;\mu$" and ∇_μ denote covariant derivatives, whereas ∂_μ are partial derivatives. This equation is for some scalar quantity ψ, but the generalization to other types of waves is straightforward. Note that for wave processes, we typically have $g_{tt} = -1$.

We could compare eqn. (2.1) to a Helmholtz equation for a homogeneous isotropic medium (e.g. consider light travelling in an ordinary block of glass). A typical Helmholtz equation, with the vector calculus gradient operator $\vec{\nabla}^2$ recast using $\vec{\nabla} \equiv (\partial_x, \partial_y, \partial_z)$, can straighforwardly be recast as

$$\left[\sum_i \partial_i v^2 \partial_i - \partial_t^2\right] H(\mathbf{r},t) = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

We have placed the v^2 wave property between the two spatial derivatives because it is often more natural – and less approximate – for it to appear there, especially if (e.g.) this second order form was derived by combining two first order equations, such as in EM or the simplified p-acoustics model [13]. The use of a squared property is also worthy of note – it has also been argued that the refractive index squared is a much more relevant quantity than index n in optical propagation [14], in particular as to how it affects the best definition of wavevector in the presence of significant gain or loss.

If we compare eqns. (2.2) and (2.1) we can see that they have a very similar form – the difference being that the isotropic speed squared v^2 has been replaced by the potentially anisotropic inverse metric g^{ij}. Thus the somewhat abstract notion of the inverse of the metric on a manifold can be replaced by the concrete and intuitive notion of a speed (squared) matrix (which we will denote using the Fraktur 'C' character as $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$). So rather than thinking just of an ordinary (and isotropic) block of glass, as suggested above for eqn. (2.2), we might now imagine a uni- or biaxial crystal with orientation dependent refractive indices. Further, note that if birefringence was present, we would require one $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$ matrix for each polarization.

Allowing anisotropy by considering materials with a speed matrix $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$ rather than an isotropic v^2 is crucial for the field of Transformation Media: the process of designing transformation devices (T-devices) relies on the introduction or alteration of material properties that differ along different directions, as well as differing still more at different locations [15]. Even the simplest possible transformation – a single axis compression – induces anisotropy, thus, any kind of general transformation theory, general or not, must incorporate it. The sole exception exists for T-devices designed by means of conformal maps [2, 16], but note that conformal cloaks are limited in that they work only for a single specific orientation, and only in two dimensions. Our wave equation in terms of $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$ is now

$$\left[\nabla_i \mathfrak{C}^{ij} \nabla_j - \partial_t^2\right] H(\mathbf{r},t) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

To summarize the treatment of waves as discussed here, we assume that *any* wave-like excitation, if sufficiently tightly specified, can be described by the second order Helmholtz wave equation. On this basis we can regard, in well-founded, but somewhat restricted terms, the Helmholtz equation as the defining description of wave processes – i.e. any wavelike excitation of a field or material follows (in some suitable limit) an archetypical Helmholtz formula with material properties contained in a speed-squared matrix $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$.

B. Rays

A ray treatment does not even require the derivation of a ray-optics or eikonal limit. This is because our T-Design process has (or will have) provided us with a spatial metric g_{ij}, which we know corresponds in inverse to the speed squared matrix $\mathfrak{C}^{ij} = g^{ij}$. Given this, can use the fact that any ray subject to a metric must follow the geodesic equation [17]

$$\frac{d^2x^i}{d\lambda^2} + \Gamma^i{}_{jk} \frac{dx^j}{d\lambda} \frac{dx^k}{d\lambda} = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Expressed in two coupled first-order pieces, it is

$$\frac{dv^i}{d\lambda} = -\Gamma^i{}_{jk} v^j v^k, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\frac{dx^i}{d\lambda} = v^i, \tag{2.6}$$

where

$$\Gamma^i{}_{jk} = \frac{1}{2} g^{im} \left[\partial_k g_{jm} + \partial_j g_{km} - \partial_m g_{jk}\right]. \tag{2.7}$$

Although the $\Gamma^i{}_{jk}$ are coordinate choice dependent, the geodesic equation does show how a geodesic traverses the space, and that interesting geodesic behaviour depends on the existence of variation in the properties of the metric. The crucial thing to note here is that just as for the Helmholtz style second order wave equation, the controlling property for the geodesics – for motion or transport across the manifold – is the metric.

It is also worth noting that the geodesic equation can be rearranged from that given above into

$$\frac{d}{d\lambda}\left(g_{ij}\frac{dx^j}{d\lambda}\right) = \frac{1}{2} g_{mn,i} \frac{dx^m}{d\lambda}\frac{dx^n}{d\lambda}, \tag{2.8}$$

which could be regarded as the generalized Eikonal equation. Indeed, one can start from the covariant wave equation, and by making the usual short-wavelength and ray-limit approximations, derive eqn. (2.8) in a comparable way as for the ordinary Eikonal equation for isotropic materials.

C. Diffusions

We will consider two types of equation under the heading "diffusion". Firstly, although not usually regarded as a diffusion equation, we can flip the sign on the time derivative term of the Helmholtz equation. This amounts to choosing $g^{00} = +1$ in the covariant form. To emphasize that we intend to treat diffusion-like processes, we replace the inverse metric

g^{ij} not with a speed squared matrix $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$ but a diffusion matrix $\mathfrak{D}^{ij}$, so that

$$\left[\partial_i \mathfrak{D}^{ij} \partial_j + \partial_t^2\right] H(\mathbf{r},t) = 0. \tag{2.9}$$

Thus it is straightforward to see that whatever mathematical process worked or works for the usual covariant wave equation as described above will work identically for this – as long as we do not implement any temporal or spacetime transformations.

More traditional diffusion equations – or even Schrödinger type equations – which contain only a first order time derivative can also be treated under the same Helmholtz-based machinery outlined above. This allows us to bring calculations such as that of the heat diffusion cloak [11] into the unified picture described in this work.

To demonstrate how the transformation schemes for waves and diffusions follow the same process, we first define a "shadow" Helmholtz equation for a field S, intended to mimic a diffusion equation in some suitable limit[1]. For this we require an added $\alpha^2 S$ source term on the RHS, and to define a new diffusive field quantity H_s related to the shadow field S with $S = H_s \exp(-\zeta t)$. This means that

$$\left[\partial_i \mathfrak{C}^{ij} \partial_j + \partial_t^2\right] S(\mathbf{r},t) = \alpha^2 S(\mathbf{r},t), \tag{2.10}$$

$$\left[\partial_i \mathfrak{C}^{ij} \partial_j + \zeta^2 - 2\zeta\partial_t + \partial_t^2\right] H_s(\mathbf{r},t) = \alpha^2 H_s(\mathbf{r},t). \tag{2.11}$$

We then assume that there is some large enough value of ζ so that H_s will always vary slowly compared to $\exp(-\zeta t)$, i.e.

$$|\zeta| \gg \left|\frac{\partial_t H_s}{H_s}\right|, \tag{2.12}$$

and so we can drop the $\partial_t^2 H_s$ term from the above equation since it is negligible. If we also match the source-like parameter α to ζ with $\alpha^2 = \zeta^2$, we can rearrange eqn. (2.11) and put $\mathfrak{D}^{ij} = \mathfrak{C}^{ij}/2\zeta$ to get

$$\left[\partial_i \mathfrak{D}^{ij} \partial_j - \partial_t\right] H_s(\mathbf{r},t) = 0. \tag{2.13}$$

This has the same form as a diffusion or Schrödinger equation, if the appropriate interpretation of the parameters is made[2]. And although the ordinary Schrödinger equation only incorporates a scalar mass, when in periodic potentials, such as those in found in crystals, anisotropic effective masses often arise [19].

As a result of the above calculation, given any diffusion/Schrödinger equation of the form eqn. (2.13) we can choose a sufficiently large ζ, calculate the effective $\mathfrak{C}^{ij} = 2\zeta\mathfrak{D}^{ij}$, transform it in the way described below to get the desired device's effective speed squared $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij}$, and then the desired device's diffusion $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{ij} = \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij}/2\zeta$.

[1] This shadow system, if necessary, can be considered to follow the same pair of first order equations as p-acoustics; see sec. II D

[2] Note that there are more systematic ways of converting between second order and Schrödinger equation forms [18].

Note that the properties of field H and parameter ζ are only constrained by the need to satisfy the approximation on eqn. (2.12); they are merely used to define a "shadow" Helmholtz equation which is not intended to have a direct physical interpretation. It is only necessary that we can connect this transformable shadow system to the physical diffusive equation, so that we can work out how diffusions transform.

Indeed, since ζ is a simple scalar and $\mathfrak{D}^{ij}$ is directly proportional to $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$, we can just transform $\mathfrak{D}^{ij}$ directly to determine the necessary T-device diffusion properties.

D. Making the metric

Although general equations such as eqns. (2.1), (2.5), or (2.13) are invaluable starting points, in general we need to justify their use based on particular physical models. These models then will show us what constitutive or material parameters will combine, and in what way they combine, to form the effective metric for that type of wave. Here we will do this following our previous work which attempted a unification of T-optics and T-acoustics [13]; i.e. we derive second order wave equations directly from a generalization of a p-acoustic model [13], as well as from electromagnetism (EM).

One critical point about any derivation that proceeds from the original first order equations for either p-acoustics or EM is that we assume the underlying constitutive parameters have a limited spatial and temporal dependence; typically we at least assume that they vary slowly enough on the scale of a wavelength; this constraint is in accordance with that specifying that the determinant of the metric undergoes negligible change in the simplifed covariant wave equation.

In the case of generalized p-acoustics, the equations for velocity field v^i, and momentum density V^i, in combination with quantities P and p^{ij} can be written in an indexed form. In the rest frame of the acoustic medium, we have

$$\partial_t P = -\partial_i v^i, \qquad \partial_t V^m = -\partial_n p^{mn}, \tag{2.14}$$

$$p^{jk} = -\kappa^{jk} P \qquad V^m = \rho^m{}_i v^i, \tag{2.15}$$

where we also need to know that $\kappa^{rs}\bar{\kappa}_{rs} = 1$, and $\bar{\rho}_m{}^{i'}\rho^m{}_i = \delta^{i'}{}_i$. As expected, the momentum density field is related to the velocity field by a matrix of mass-density parameters $\rho^m{}_i$.

For ordinary p-acoustics, P is a scalar field representing the local population, and $\kappa^{ij} = \kappa_o \delta^{ij}$ repesents the bulk modulus; as a result $p^{kl} = p_o \delta^{kl}$ so that p_o is a pressure field. There is also a version of p-acoustics that mimics pentamode materials [20], where the modulus κ^{ij} is a symmetric matrix but $\rho^{ij} = \rho_o \delta^{ij}$. Most generally, p-acoustics allows the case where κ^{ij} and p^{jk} can be (at least in principle) any symmetric matrix; in this case P represents the amplitude of an oscillating stress field whose orientation is determined by κ^{jk}, and where the restoring stress is p^{jk} is proportional to P.

The usual process for generating a second order wave equation then leads straightforwardly to

$$\partial_t^2 P = \partial_i \mathfrak{C}^{ij} \partial_j P \tag{2.16}$$

with a speed-squared matrix $\mathfrak{C}^{is}$ that depends on the bulk modulus κ and the mass density i.e.

$$\mathfrak{C}^{ij} = \bar{\rho}_n{}^i \kappa^{nj}, \tag{2.17}$$

where $\bar{\rho}_n{}^i \rho^m{}_i = \delta^m{}_n$.

In the case of EM we can rewrite the vector Maxwell equations in an indexed form which incorporates the vector cross product by turning the electric and magnetic fields E^i and H^l into antisymmetrized matrices e^{kj} and $-h^{mn}$; these also match up with the purely spatial parts of the EM tensors $*F$ and G. The indexed equations, which also can be extracted from a matrix representation of the covariant tensor Maxwell equations (see e.g. [13]), can be written,

$$\partial_t B^j = -\partial_k e^{kj}, \qquad \partial_t D^m = -\partial_n h^{mn} \tag{2.18}$$

$$h^{mn} = \eta^{mn}{}_j B^j, \qquad D^m = \varepsilon^m{}_{kl} e^{kl}, \tag{2.19}$$

where $\bar{\eta}_{mn}{}^{j'} \eta^{mn}{}_j = \delta^{j'}{}_j$, and $\bar{\varepsilon}_m{}^{k'l'} \varepsilon^m{}_{kl} = \delta^{k'}{}_k \delta^{l'}{}_l$. As a result the speed-squared matrix depends on antisymetrized versions of the permitivitty ε_{ij} and inverse permeability η_{kl}; and are segments (blocks) excised from the dual of the constitutive tensor as used by Kinsler and McCall [13][3]. They are

$$\varepsilon^m{}_{kl} = *\chi^{m0}{}_{kl}, \qquad \text{and} \qquad \eta^{mn}{}_j = *\chi^{mn}{}_{0j}, \tag{2.22}$$

and for homogeneous material parameters leads to a multi-polarization speed-squared matrix which is

$$\mathfrak{C}^{klm}{}_j = \left[\varepsilon^n{}_{kl}\right]^{-1} \eta^{nm}{}_j = \bar{\varepsilon}_n{}^{kl} \eta^{nm}{}_j \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathfrak{C}^{km} \delta^l{}_j, \tag{2.23}$$

where the simpler form indicated by the arrow assumes the typical case where the constitutive parameters provide no cross-coupling between polarizations.

As a final emphasis as to the value of the "speed squared" denomination of a T-device, note that a determination of the water wave speed profile was the natural one to use when designing and building the Maxwell's Fishpond [21].

The above shows us what material parameters will need to be engineered to control either waves or rays for acoustic-like or EM scenarios. The next piece of the puzzle is to show what material parameters need to be manipulated to control diffusion processes.

[3] However, note that although that paper used $\chi^{\mu\nu}{}_{\gamma\delta}$ for the dual of the usual EM constitutive tensor $\chi^{\mu\nu\gamma\delta}$, it denoted this only by the alternate indexing, not (as would often be done) by $*\chi^{\mu\nu}{}_{\gamma\delta}$. Also, it is helpful to note that if the vector components of the usual electric displacement $\mathbf{D}$ are denoted D_i for $i \in \{x,y,z\}$ and are related to $\mathbf{E}$ (or E_i) by the usual vector-calculus style expression

$$D_i = \varepsilon_{ix} E_x + \varepsilon_{iy} E_y + \varepsilon_{iz} E_z, \tag{2.20}$$

then the components of the j-th slice of $\varepsilon^j{}_{kl}$ in eqn. (2.22) are

$$\left[\varepsilon^j{}_{kl}\right] = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\varepsilon_{jz} & +\varepsilon_{jy} \\ +\varepsilon_{jz} & 0 & -\varepsilon_{jx} \\ -\varepsilon_{jy} & +\varepsilon_{jx} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{2.21}$$

A similar expression can be found for the j-slices of $\eta^{kl}{}_j$.

Since an important case of diffusion is defined by the heat diffusion equation, and it is one already considered by the T-Design community [11], we will start there. The diffusion equation for a temperature distribution $u(\mathbf{r},t)$, is often written in ordinary vector calculus notation as $\rho c_p \partial_t u = \nabla \cdot K \cdot \nabla u$ for density ρ, specific heat c_p, and potentially anisotropic thermal conductivity matrix with components K^{ij}. The positioning of K in this equation is the "natural" one, and has not required any approximation involving slow/negligible spatial variation.

Here we first take a step back and write two first order equations in a style reminiscent of p-acoustics and the presentation of EM as above. Although in the following we examine heat diffusion in particular, the equations are equally applicable to other diffusion processes, as long as the appropriate reinterpretations of the physical variables are made. We therefore start with a conservation equation relating an energy density h and an energy flux v^i which is

$$\partial_t h = -\nabla_i v^i. \tag{2.24}$$

We then rewrite the usual expression relating heat flux V^i to temperature profile u which is $V^i = K^{ij} \nabla_j u$ using a 'temperature impulse' W^i as

$$\partial_t W^k = -\nabla_i u^{ij}. \tag{2.25}$$

Here the temperature profile is allowed to be anisotropic, which does not necessarily have a clear physical meaning; typically we will expect u^{ij} to be diagonal.

With the assumption that u^{ij} is proportional to h, but W^i and v^j are related by a first order differential equation, we (can) write the following constitutive relations (equations of state),

$$u^{ij} = \sigma^{ij} h, \tag{2.26}$$

$$\partial_t W^k = -\gamma \beta^k_j v^j. \tag{2.27}$$

Here σ^{ij} plays the role of the inverse of the product ρc_p. Note that we will also need $\beta^k_j \bar{\beta}^j_l = \delta^k_l$. Substitution of eqn. (2.25) into eqn. (2.24) then gives us

$$\partial_t h = \nabla_l \left(\gamma^{-1} \bar{\beta}^l_j\right) \nabla_i u^{ij} \quad = \nabla_l \left(\gamma^{-1} \bar{\beta}^l_j\right) \nabla_i \sigma^{ij} h \tag{2.28}$$

This is just a diffusion equation for h, and if σ^{ij} is homogeneous (or has negligible spatial variation), then

$$\partial_t h = \nabla_l \left(\gamma^{-1} \bar{\beta}^l_j\right) \sigma^{ij} \nabla_i h \quad = \nabla_i \mathfrak{D}^{ij} \nabla_j h, \tag{2.29}$$

where in comparison to the original K^{ij}, ρ, c_p quantities,

$$\mathfrak{D}^{ij} = G^l_j \sigma^{ij} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \mathfrak{D}^{ij} = K^{ij} / (\rho c_p). \tag{2.30}$$

Following this, we now know how to relate the heat equation parameters to the diffusion, and hence to the transformed metric, just as for the wave and ray theories already described. Note that other diffusion equations can also easily be recast into the form used above.



FIG. 1: (Diffeo)-morphism. Points $\mathscr{P}$ in the reference manifold $\mathscr{U}$ are mapped to points $\varphi(\mathscr{P})$ in the T-device manifold $\mathscr{V}$ by the morphism (mapping) φ. The $\mathbb{R}^3$ coordinate representation of the morphism, is $\psi\circ\varphi\circ\phi^{-1}:\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}^3$. This means that the *design* of the T-device is specified by φ, but that expression of that design in coordinate terms – the "blueprint" – is $\psi\circ\varphi\circ\phi^{-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

III. TRANSFORMATIONS

From the preceeding section, we can see that both (second order) wave and ray propagation, and even diffusion processes can be packaged in a way dependent on the same mathematics; and that how that mathematics describes propagation depends intimately on the metric. The question now is – for a chosen transformation (deformation) of some kind, how do we calculate how the metric must change, if we insist that the wave normals, and ray trajectories (geodesics), are shifted *only* by that deformation.

A. Metrics and coordinate transformations

If we adhere to the traditional coordinate-based interpretation of T-Design, then we can transform the metric simply with the notional coordinate transform that we use to define our desired T-device. Coordinate transformations of representations of tensors depend on the differential relationships between the old and new coordinates, i.e.

$$x^{\alpha'}=f(x^{\alpha}) \qquad \text{then} \qquad \Lambda^{\alpha'}{}_{\alpha}=\frac{\partial f(x^{\alpha})}{\partial x^{\alpha}}. \tag{3.1}$$

So a metric g and its inverse re-represented in new primed coordinates would be

$$g_{\alpha'\beta'}=\Lambda^{\alpha}{}_{\alpha'}g_{\alpha\beta}\Lambda^{\beta}{}_{\beta'}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$g^{\alpha'\beta'}=\Lambda^{\alpha'}{}_{\alpha}g^{\alpha\beta}\Lambda^{\beta'}{}_{\beta}. \tag{3.3}$$

So, in the standard T-Design paradigm if the coordinate transformation has the effect of changing our reference case geodesics into new, useful, device geodesics; then we need to adapt our material parameters from the reference values to those that give rise to the T-device metric $g_{\alpha'\beta'}$.

We have already seen that an expression of a metric $g_{\alpha\beta}$ can be inverted to give speed-squared matrix $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$; thus the inverted T-device metric $g^{\alpha'\beta'}$ tells us what the T-device speed-squared matrix $\mathfrak{C}'^{ij}$ must be. Our knowledge of whatever chosen physical system we want to build the device using then tells us what material properties are needed to achieve the necessary $\mathfrak{C}'^{ij}$ and hence implement the T-device.

However: *if any physical idea must be expressible in a way that is independent of coordinates; how can any claimed "coordinate transformation" hope to represent the design or specification of a new device?*

In what follows, we present a more sophisticated method which encapsulates the necesary mathematical and physical steps needed to implement the process of T-Design.

B. Metric induced by a diffeomorphism

The mathematical underpinning of all transformation theories is in fact not that of coordinate transformation, but that of a *morphism* φ that maps a point $\mathscr{P}$ on a reference ("design") manifold $\mathscr{U}$ to another point $\varphi(\mathscr{P})$ in a "device" manifold $\mathscr{V}$, as seen on Fig. 1. Coordinate maps $\phi:\mathscr{U}\to\mathbb{R}^3$ at $\mathscr{P}$, and $\psi:\mathscr{V}\to\mathbb{R}^3$ at $\varphi(\mathscr{P})$, give the coordinate representation of φ as

$$\psi\circ\varphi\circ\phi^{-1}:\mathbb{R}^3\to\mathbb{R}^3. \tag{3.4}$$

However, in T-Optics, φ prescribes the electromagnetic medium in the device manifold $\mathscr{V}$ for (typically) a vacuum-like manifold $\mathscr{U}$, before any discussion of coordinates [22, 23].

Now we need to work out how to specify the device metric $\tilde{g}_{ij}$, as induced by φ, in terms of the reference/design metric $\hat{g}_{ij}$. Often $\hat{g}_{ij}$ will just be a flat Minkowski metric η_{ij}, but not always. The morphed/device metric is specified by

$$\tilde{g}_{\mathscr{P}}(X_{\mathscr{P}},Y_{\mathscr{P}})=\hat{g}_{\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{P})}(\varphi^{*}X_{\mathscr{P}},\varphi^{*}Y_{\mathscr{P}}), \tag{3.5}$$

where we have to *pull back* $X_{\mathscr{P}}, Y_{\mathscr{P}}$ with respect to the diffeomorphism φ. With some thought, we can see that this should be the expected behaviour: what we usually are typically trying to achieve is to make interesting trajectories into the "new normal". E.g. we make a cloak-like device structure in the laboratory, with specified cloak-like wave or ray paths, into an actual cloak by insisting its properties are such that those paths look to the outside world as if they were in an unremarkable piece of vacuum. I.e., we are trying to make a device (cloak) manifold $\mathscr{V}$ look like the design (vacuum) manifold $\mathscr{U}$, and not the other way around.

We can also write down an indexed form of the morphism φ. With $\tilde{\nu}$ referring to the indexing of $\mathscr{V}$, and $\hat{\beta}$ referring to the indexing of $\mathscr{U}$, we have that

$$(\varphi^{*})^{\tilde{\nu}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}\Big|_{\mathscr{P}}=(\varphi_{*})^{\tilde{\nu}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}\Big|_{\mathscr{P}}=\frac{\partial y^{\tilde{\nu}}}{\partial x^{\hat{\beta}}}\Big|_{\mathscr{P}}. \tag{3.6}$$

Note that here the positioning of the asterisk denoting (in subscript) push forward, or (in superscript) pull back, turns out to

be irrelevant; the indexing already carries the necessary information. Quantities like $(\varphi)^{\tilde{\nu}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}$ are to be evaluated at $\mathscr{P}$ and those like $(\varphi)^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\tilde{\mu}}$ are evaluated at $\varphi^{-1}(\mathscr{P})$. We just need to remember that $(\varphi)^{\tilde{\nu}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}(\varphi)^{\hat{\beta}}{}_{\tilde{\mu}} = \delta^{\tilde{\nu}}{}_{\tilde{\mu}}$ and $(\varphi)^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\varphi)^{\tilde{\mu}}{}_{\hat{\beta}} = \delta^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}$. Hence eqn. (3.5) tells us how to calculate the metric and its inverse in indexed notation, i.e.

$$\tilde{g}_{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} = (\varphi)^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\tilde{\mu}}(\varphi)^{\hat{\beta}}{}_{\tilde{\nu}}\, \hat{g}_{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$\tilde{g}^{\tilde{\mu}\tilde{\nu}} = (\varphi)^{\tilde{\mu}}{}_{\hat{\alpha}}(\varphi)^{\tilde{\nu}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}\, \hat{g}^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}}. \tag{3.8}$$

We might instead retain the asterisk denoting push forward and pull back, but desist from overloading the indexing typography. This is the scheme that we will follow in the next section which treats some specific examples, and leads to

$$\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = (\varphi_*)^{\alpha}{}_{\mu}(\varphi_*)^{\beta}{}_{\nu}\, \hat{g}_{\alpha\beta}, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\tilde{g}^{\mu\nu} = (\varphi^*)^{\mu}{}_{\alpha}(\varphi^*)^{\nu}{}_{\beta}\, \hat{g}^{\alpha\beta}. \tag{3.10}$$

Notably, if we were to replace the "(φ)" notation with a coordinate-transform mimicking "Λ", then the operations done here, in this more sophisticated push-forward/ pull-back would match the use in the coordinate transform approach (see e.g. [13]); albeit with the significant additional advantage of being mathematically and physically correct.

C. Transformations, Morphisms

It is critical to notice at this point that if we specify the morphism in terms of how one coordinate point is moved to another, then we are only adjusting distances; i.e. only adjusting the effective metric. The morphism does not directly specify how other properties such as field values, ratios, or impedances have been affected. However, all geometric objects are nevertheless implicitly transformed by the morphism, even though the morphing process here is only targetted at the speed-squared matrix $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$ (i.e. the inverse metric), and nothing else. However, it is possible to transform these independently if we so choose [24, 25]. For example, choosing the usual kappa medium assumption of "$\varepsilon = \mu$" in an electromagnetic scenario has implications for impedance [26], but such an identification has nothing to do with the morphism itself, which says nothing about the $\varepsilon : \mu$ ratio. Indeed, the specification of a physical system in which to implement our desired T-Design – which may or may not turn out to be EM – *need not even have been decided yet.*

IV. EXAMPLES

As noted above, typically T-devices are described with a "transformation" narrative, where we talk of transforming an unremarkable reference space into an interesting device space. Hence the typical description of a cloaking transformation being that a point in a flat space is expanded and pushed outwards to form a disk, and where (outwardly) the inside of that disk ("core") region is invisible.

In the more rigorous morphism language we instead represent the deformation that takes the device (or "laboratory") space manifold ($\mathscr{V}$), with its missing disk, and alters the metric on that manifold so as to "pull it inwards'. As a result $\mathscr{V}$ then acts as if it were like a design (i.e. apparent, or "reference") manifold ($\mathscr{U}$) only missing a single point. This is the reverse narrative of the (usual) transformation one, and the mathematical and physical reasons for this were described in the previous section.

However, the reason why the usual transformation narrative is not without its uses is that non-trival reference manifolds might have metrics and geodesics with all kinds of interesting properties, involving ones that have foci, caustics, or that form loops. And whatever the exotic properties of our T-device might be in re-presenting the physical reality to an observer, it must be capable of being mapped onto that apparent manifold. By starting a design process with the intended (design) behaviour, and morphing (push forward) to the device behaviour guarantees that our aim is achievable, at least in principle. This specification means that the morphism should also have differentiable inverse, i.e. be a diffeomorphism.

In the examples below, the necessary device metric $\tilde{g}_{ij}$ can be calculated from the design metric $\hat{g}_{ij}$ using the components $(\varphi)^{i}{}_{l}$ of the design morphism φ. Using square brackets to indicate a matrix-like representation, we find that

$$\left[\tilde{g}_{ij}\right] = \left[(\varphi_*)^{l}{}_{i}\right]\left[\hat{g}_{lm}\right]\left[(\varphi_*)^{m}{}_{j}\right]^{T}, \tag{4.1}$$

$$\left[\tilde{g}^{ij}\right] = \left[(\varphi^*)^{i}{}_{l}\right]\left[\hat{g}^{lm}\right]\left[(\varphi^*)^{j}{}_{m}\right]^{T} = \left[\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij}\right]. \tag{4.2}$$

Here the second line represents the next, more pragmatic step, where the device metric is inverted to generate the speed-squared matrix $[\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij}]$ that we need to engineer using the relevant material properties. Note that this transformation also uses the φ^* pull back form of the morphism φ. In the examples that follow, we will use the phrase "non-trivial" to describe any diffeomorphism components $(\varphi^*)^{i}{}_{l}$ that differ from the identity transformation value of δ^{i}_{l}. For example, if we chose to restrict ourselves to a cylindrical geometry, with only radial transformations, the only non-trival components will be radial ones.

Further, we also show only ray examples, because strictly speaking only in the ray limit is the metric approach exact. In any case, the literature is already full of wave-cloak pictures for various degrees of approximation in the underlying model. A careful analysis demonstrating of the effects of the neglected impedance and metric determinant terms is no simple matter, and is addressed elsewhere [26, 27].

A. Cylindrical cloak

The cylindrical cloak first introduced by Pendry et al [1] is the most famous T-device. Its design is usually expressed as expanding a central point into a disk (or *core*) $r = R$ in diameter, while compressing its *"halo"* – the space between the point and the outer rim at $r = S$ accordingly. It therefore preserves the effective distance between inner and outer radii as being the same as (just) the outer radius. It is usually written

in cylindrical coordinates, and a general form allowing for a variety of radial transformations is

$$\hat{r} = f(\tilde{r}), \quad \hat{\theta} = \tilde{\theta}, \quad \hat{z} = \tilde{z}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $f(\tilde{r})$ is some suitably well behaved function increasing from $f(R) = 0$ to $f(S) = S$; it is the derivative of this f which specifies the only non-trivial morphism component $(\varphi^*)^r{}_r$.

In the original proposal [1], f was simply the linear

$$f(\tilde{r}) = \frac{S}{S-R}(\tilde{r} - R). \tag{4.4}$$

Here $\tilde{r}, \tilde{\theta}, \tilde{z}$ are the device coordinates where waves or rays are confined to $\tilde{r} > R$, and so hiding points where $\tilde{r} < R$. Otherwise, the coordinates $\hat{r}, \hat{\theta}, \hat{z}$ span the design space where waves or rays are allowed at any $\hat{r} > 0$.

Let us assume for additional generality that we want the design spatial metric (i.e. the apparent metric of our device) to have independent radial, angular, and axial refractive index profiles $n(\hat{r})$, $m(\hat{\theta})$, $s(\hat{z})$. This allows us, for example, to consider adding a cloak to a 2D Maxwell's fisheye device [16, 28], where $m(\hat{\theta}) = 1$, $s(\hat{z}) = 1$ and $n(\hat{r}) = n_0/[1 + (r/r_0)^2]$. Our design metric is then

$$d\hat{S}^2 = n^2(\hat{r})d\hat{r}^2 + m^2(\hat{\theta})\hat{r}^2 d\hat{\theta}^2 + s^2(\hat{z})d\hat{z}^2, \tag{4.5}$$

$$\text{or} \qquad \hat{g}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} n^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s^2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.6}$$

This means that whilst an outside observer with no reason to make complicating assumptions would presume geodesics which match those in the design spatial metric, that region can have properties that differ according to some morphism φ. A morphism φ based on the transformation f from eqn. (4.3) has the important (non trivial) component $(\varphi_A)^r{}_r = f' = \partial f/\partial\tilde{r}$. With this, it hides the core region as a result of generating the required device spatial metric of

$$d\tilde{S}^2 = n^2(f(\tilde{r}))\left[\frac{df(\tilde{r})}{d\tilde{r}}\right]^2 d\tilde{r}^2 + m^2(\tilde{\theta})\left[\frac{f(\tilde{r})}{\tilde{r}}\right]^2 \tilde{r}^2 d\tilde{\theta}^2 + s^2(\tilde{z})d\tilde{z}^2, \tag{4.7}$$

which, as should be expected, looks like (is) the same result as that obtained by the misleadingly named "coordinate transformation" approaches [29, 30] based on equations like eqn. (4.3). This interval-style dS^2 metric can also be written in a matrix-like form, with $n \equiv n(f(\tilde{r}))$, $m \equiv m(\tilde{\theta})$, $s \equiv s(\tilde{z})$, i.e.

$$\tilde{g}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} n^2 f'^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m^2 f^2/\tilde{r}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & s^2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{4.8}$$

As described above we can convert – by a simple inversion – this T-device metric into the corresponding speed-squared matrix, i.e.

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij} = \tilde{g}^{ij} = \left[\tilde{g}_{ij}\right]^{-1} \tag{4.9}$$



FIG. 2: Radial cloak based on the logarithmic function given in eqn. (4.10). One nice feature of this cloaking function is that it has both index and gradient matching at the outer boundary $S = eR$ of the halo.

We might, for example, design a new radial cloak using the logarithm function so that it could be better impedance matched than the original (linear) radial cloak [1], at its outer boundary. Whilst the original cloak was impedance matched only in the radial (r) direction, this "log radial cloak" gradient matches the design to its exterior to acheve a more gradual transition – it is also impedance matched in θ. The log radial cloak is designed using

$$F(\tilde{r}) = S\log[\tilde{r}/R], \quad \text{so that} \quad F'(\tilde{r}) = S/\tilde{r}. \tag{4.10}$$

To work, this log radial cloak requires a fixed core-to-halo ratio so that $S = eR$. The mapping between $\tilde{r}$ and $\hat{r}$ is shown on fig. 2. The disadvantage of this design is that there is a stronger gradient at its interface with the core than with the original; for particular experimental implementations, this disadvantage may outweigh the benefits of its improved impedance matching at the outer boundary. This is because cloak performance can be strongly affected by imperfect implementation of the inner (core) boundary, although this would not be relevant in the near-miss case of a narrow beam that only passes through the outer part of the cloak halo.

So for an EM wave in this T-device cloak where we choose the case where the electric polarization is not aligned along θ, we find that $\varepsilon_z, \varepsilon_r, \mu_r, \mu_\theta$ are the controlling constitutive parameters. Therefore in cylindrical coordinates we have

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_z\mu_\theta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon_z\mu_r & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_r\mu_\theta \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/n^2F'^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{r}^2/m^2F^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/s^2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.11}$$

Alternatively, we might have chosen the complementary case where the magnetic field is not aligned along θ.

For a scalar p-acoustics wave in the same cloaking T-device there is *no* scope for a choice of polarizations, unlike the EM



FIG. 3: Comparison of the linear-radial [1] and log-radial cloaking transforms designed to match a flat space. Sample of ray trajectories and refractive index ellipses are shown. Figures provided by R.D. Topf.



FIG. 4: Radial cloak on a spherical surface, again based on a logarithmic function. A random selection ray paths are shown, all being forced by the cloak to avoid the core region which extends up to 20° from the north pole, whilst also returning smoothly to their expected "great circle" paths outside the cloak halo at $e\times 20^\circ \simeq 54^\circ$.

case above. In cylindrical coordinates we have a unique specification for the constitutive parameters that is

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij} = \kappa_o \begin{bmatrix} \rho_{rr} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{\theta\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_{zz} \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/n^2F'^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{r}^2/m^2F^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/s^2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.12}$$

A comparison of the EM and scalar p-acoustics cases is instructive. In EM, for each of the two possible field polarizations we can implement the three necessary cloak parameters $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{rr}, \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{\theta\theta}, \tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{zz}$ using up to six constitutive parameters, i.e. we have three "spare" degrees of freedom. In contrast, the p-acoustic version has only four constitutive parameters with which to make up the three cloak parameters, i.e. only one degree of freedom: we could e.g. leave κ_o untouched and engineer each of $\rho_{rr}, \rho_{\theta\theta}, \rho_{zz}$. This significantly impacts our ability to fine-tune the p-acoustic cloak for either impedance matching or in response to technological constraints.

A pentamode p-acoustics wave has additional constitutive freedom compared to the scalar version, since κ is now matrix-like. In cylindrical coordinates, the same cloaking T-device has a specification for the constitutive parameters based on diagonal κ^{ij} and $\rho^k_{\ l}$ properties is

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\kappa_{rr}}{\rho_{rr}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\kappa_{\theta\theta}}{\rho_{\theta\theta}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\kappa_{zz}}{\rho_{zz}} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1/n^2F'^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{r}^2/m^2F^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/s^2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.13}$$

However, κ^{nj} and $\bar{\rho}_n^{\ i}$ need not be diagonal as long as their product $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij}$ is.

However, despite caveats regarding impedance matching, *the wave or ray "steering" performance of these implementations is as identical as the identical metrics upon which they are based*; only their scattering properties are different.

In the case of heat diffusion, we can just implement the $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij}$ directly as the diffusion matrix

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{ij} = \frac{1}{\rho c_p}\left[K^{ij}\right] = \begin{bmatrix} 1/n^2F'^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \tilde{r}^2/m^2F^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/s^2 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4.14}$$

with constant density ρ and specific heat c_p, and an anistropic thermal conductivity K^{ij}.

B. Cloak on a sphere

Here our design space is a 2D spherical surface of radius R which is most naturally expressed in spherical polar coordinates. Allowing for independent angular indices $T(\hat{\theta})$, $P(\hat{\phi})$, this has a design spatial metric which is

$$d\hat{S}^2 = T^2(\hat{\theta})R^2 d\hat{\theta}^2 + P^2(\hat{\phi})R^2\sin^2(\hat{\theta})d\hat{\phi}^2, \tag{4.15}$$

with the variation in polar angle $\hat{\theta}$ denoting lines of "longitude", and variation in the azimuthal angle $\hat{\phi}$ being latitude. The sensible choice is to orient the coordinates so that both the missing point in the design (target) space, and the missing spherical cap in the device (laboratory) space, are centered on the pole. In this case we leave the azimuthal ϕ untouched so that $\tilde{\phi} = \hat{\phi}$, but offset and rescale the polar angle $\hat{\theta}$ so that

$$\hat{\theta} = f(\tilde{\theta}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\theta} = f^{-1}(\hat{\theta}) = F(\hat{\theta}). \tag{4.16}$$

Thus the morphed device metric, with $(\varphi_B)^{\theta}_{\ \theta} = f'(\tilde{\theta}) = df(\tilde{\theta})/d\tilde{\theta}$, is

$$dS^2 = \left[T(f(\tilde{\theta}))\, f'(\tilde{\theta})\right]^2 R^2 d\tilde{\theta}^2 + \left[P(\tilde{\phi})\frac{\sin\left(f(\tilde{\theta})\right)}{\sin(\tilde{\theta})}\right]^2 R^2\sin^2(\tilde{\theta})d\phi^2, \tag{4.17}$$

which has been written in a way to make it clear how the new (T-device) metric needs to be engineered away from the design space's unmodified spherical geometry. Our T-device needs the longitudinal component of rays (or waves) to see an index a factor of $f'(\tilde{\theta})$ larger than the background; whereas the latitudinal component needs to see a different index depending on how close to the cloak core (at θ_0) they are.

For example, with a standard linear transformation where $\tilde{\theta} = \alpha\hat{\theta} + \theta_0$, and with $T \equiv T(f(\tilde{\theta}))$ and $P \equiv P(\tilde{\phi})$, where



FIG. 5: Radial cloak on a spherical surface, again based on a logarithmic function; however unlike fig. 4 the original spherical surface has a varying instead of a constant background index; this perturbs the ray paths. This figure shows only a long segment taken from a single ray path, which returns to the vicinity of the north pole to be cloaked (from) over and over again. The thin lines show the path the ray would have taken if the cloak were not present.

$\alpha = 1-\theta_0/\pi$, then the device metric must be

$$d\tilde{S}^2 = \left[\frac{T}{\alpha}\right]^2 R^2 d\tilde{\theta}^2 + \left[P\frac{\sin\left(\frac{\tilde{\theta}-\theta_0}{\alpha}\right)}{\sin(\tilde{\theta})}\right]^2 R^2\sin^2(\tilde{\theta})d\tilde{\phi}^2. \tag{4.18}$$

An alternative cloaking deformation based on the logarithmic one used in subsection IV A could be $\tilde{\theta} = \theta_0\exp(\hat{\theta}/e\theta_0)$. This morphism has taken a partial spherical manifold and morphed it into a (near) full sphere; thus the morphism applies only over $\tilde{\theta}\in(\theta_0, e\theta_0]$ and (but) mimics the range $\hat{\theta}\in(0, e\theta_0]$. On the rest of the sphere, i.e. for angles $\theta\in(e\theta_0,\pi]$, we have that $\tilde{\theta}=\hat{\theta}$. This gives a morphed (T-device) metric

$$d\tilde{S}^2 = \left[\frac{Te\theta_0}{\tilde{\theta}}\right]^2 R^2 d\tilde{\theta}^2 + \left[P\frac{\sin\left(e\theta_0\log\left\{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{\theta_0}\right\}\right)}{\sin(\tilde{\theta})}\right]^2 R^2\sin^2(\tilde{\theta})d\tilde{\phi}^2, \tag{4.19}$$

where since the metric is diagonal, the $\theta\theta$ and $\phi\phi$ components of the inverse-metric $\tilde{g}^{ij}$, speed squared $\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{ij}$, or diffusion $\tilde{\mathfrak{D}}^{ij}$ matrices, are just given by the inverse of square bracket terms. These inverses are in essence just rescaling factors for the speeds c_θ and c_ϕ on the sphere in the angular and azimuthal directions. Thus the logarithmically cloaked sphere, in the transformed region, needs to have its material parameters modified so that

$$\frac{\tilde{c}_\theta}{\hat{c}_\theta} = \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{\theta\theta}}{\hat{\mathfrak{C}}^{\theta\theta}}} = \left[\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{e\theta_0}\right], \tag{4.20}$$

$$\frac{\tilde{c}_\phi}{\hat{c}_\phi} = \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\mathfrak{C}}^{\phi\phi}}{\hat{\mathfrak{C}}^{\phi\phi}}} = \left[\frac{\sin(\tilde{\theta})}{\sin\left(e\theta_0\log\left\{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{\theta_0}\right\}\right)}\right]. \tag{4.21}$$

As before, we can choose implement this anisotropic speed profile for either EM or acoustics following a similar procedure as for the ordinary cylindrical cloak; we might equally as easily follow the rules to work out the material parameters needed for a heat diffusion cloak.

A depiction of this cloak, implemented on a featureless sphere where $T = P = 1$, is shown in fig. 4, and showing a variety of deformed – cloaked – great circle geodesic trajectories. For more complicated spheres, such as ones with a pre-existing index profiles that vary over the surface, the geodesics will no longer be great circles. Cloaking on such a sphere is displayed on fig. 5. In this example a single ray trajectory will now travel widely over the surface in a complicated manner, and so returns again and again to the north pole region to be cloaked and recloaked in different ways and from different directions.

C. Topographic transformation

Imagine we wish to control our waves or rays so that they appear to be travelling along a designer bumpy three dimensional landscape, even though they remain confined to a planar device space, albeit a plane with appropriately modulated properties. If the height of the virtual landscape is defined by the function $\hat{z} = h(\hat{x},\hat{y})$, then the required 2D metric that mimics it is based on $(\varphi_C^*)^z{}_x = \partial h/\partial\tilde{x}$ and $(\varphi_C^*)^z{}_y = \partial h/\partial\tilde{y}$, being

$$d\hat{S}^2 = \left[1+\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial\tilde{x}}\right)^2\right]d\tilde{x}^2 + \left[1+\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial\tilde{y}}\right)^2\right]d\tilde{y}^2 + 2\left[\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial\tilde{x}}\right)\left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial\tilde{y}}\right)\right]d\tilde{x}\,d\tilde{y}. \tag{4.22}$$

If, for example we wished to mimic a parabolic or hyperbolic landscape, defined by the height function $h_1(\tilde{x},\tilde{y}) = \alpha\tilde{x}^2+\beta\tilde{y}^2$, then the required device metric is

$$d\hat{S}^2 = \left[1+4\alpha^2\tilde{x}^2\right]d\tilde{x}^2 + \left[1+4\beta^2\tilde{y}^2\right]d\tilde{y}^2 + 2\left[4\alpha\beta\tilde{x}\tilde{y}\right]d\tilde{x}\,d\tilde{y}. \tag{4.23}$$

The metric components g_{xx}, g_{xy}, and g_{yy} can then be read off directly from this result. The components of $\mathfrak{C}^{ij}$ or $\mathfrak{D}^{ij}$ can then be determined, being given by the *inverse* of the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} g_{xx} & g_{xy} \\ g_{xy} & g_{yy}\end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1+4\alpha^2\tilde{x}^2 & 4\alpha\beta\tilde{x}\tilde{y} \\ 4\alpha\beta\tilde{x}\tilde{y} & 1+4\beta^2\tilde{y}^2\end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.24}$$

Alternatively, if we wished to mimic a landscape with a deep well (or peak) as defined by the height function $h_2(\tilde{x},\tilde{y}) = \gamma/(1+\alpha\tilde{x}^2+\beta\tilde{y}^2)$, then the required device metric is

$$d\hat{S}^2 = \left[1+\left(\frac{4\alpha^2}{\gamma^2}\right)\tilde{x}^2\,h_2(\tilde{x},\tilde{y})^4\right]d\tilde{x}^2 + \left[1+\left(\frac{4\beta^2}{\gamma^2}\right)\tilde{y}^2\,h_2(\tilde{x},\tilde{y})^4\right]d\tilde{y}^2 + 2\left[\left(\frac{4\alpha\beta}{\gamma^2}\right)\tilde{x}\tilde{y}\,h_2(\tilde{x},\tilde{y})^4\right]d\tilde{x}\,d\tilde{y}. \tag{4.25}$$



FIG. 6: A 3D depiction of a topographic design manifold (top), given by eqn. (4.25) with $\alpha=\beta=20$ and $\gamma=1$. The necessary metric properties of the planar device (manifold), i.e. the $\tilde{x}\tilde{x}$, $\tilde{x}\tilde{y}$, and $\tilde{y}\tilde{y}$ components, are given as color-coded surfaces below. These metric components, in a flat (planar) device, mimic the distorted design manifold.

Of course, many other landscapes can be imagined, for example those considered when making surface wave cloaks [31–33] or geodesic lenses [16, 21, 28].

This kind of landscape T-Design might lead us to consider the reverse case: can we, by transformation, modulate the properties of a bumpy but locally isotropic (device) sheet embedded in 3D – a pre-existing landscape of the type discussed above, with height $z=h(x,y)$ – so that it is designed to appears as if it were instead a flat sheet in 2D? The answer is, in general, an emphatic no; although is can be done in some specific cases: i.e. the geodesic lenses mentioned above [16, 21, 28].

Imagine we have waves or rays travelling along some kind of bumpy landscape that we wish to re-map to a flat space. Crucially, in some places, for example, the local curvature will cause some geodesics to converge at and through a focus. Now no matter what diffeomorphism we apply, we cannot remove that focus, but only shift its position. However, although a single focus for a collection of geodesics is fine in a flat space, as soon as the landscape is such that if *anywhere* a collection of geodesics share *two* foci, we cannot (in general) diffeomorphically transform this to a flat space.

D. Focus transformation

We can imagine representing device that focuses in the 2D plane as a T-Design by embedding it in 3D and twisting the space along the focal axis, as depicted in fig. 7. With z chosen as the focal axis, points are twisted off the x-axis into the xy-plane, using a rotation defined by

$$\hat{z}=\tilde{z}, \qquad \hat{x}=\tilde{x}\cos(\Phi\tilde{z}+\phi), \qquad \hat{y}=\tilde{x}\sin(\Phi\tilde{z}+\phi). \quad (4.26)$$

The device space of $\tilde{z},\tilde{x}$ will then mimic the behaviour design space's twisted version embedded in $\hat{z},\hat{x},\hat{y}$. This will involve periodic refocusings at $\Phi\tilde{z}+\phi=(2n+1)\pi/2$. This T-Design specification means that the two spaces differ in a nontrivial way (only) due to $(\varphi_E^*)^x{}_x$, $(\varphi_E^*)^x{}_z$, $(\varphi_E^*)^y{}_x$, and $(\varphi_E^*)^y{}_z$. These



FIG. 7: A 3D depiction of the helical design manifold used in the focus transformation, with a $\hat{z}$-dependent colour gradient to aid interpretation, and the resulting ray trajectories in $\tilde{x}\tilde{z}$-plane of the device (manifold).

give

$$d\hat{z}=d\tilde{z}, \quad (4.27)$$
$$d\hat{x}=-\Phi\tilde{x}\sin(\Phi\tilde{z}+\phi)d\tilde{z}+\cos(\Phi\tilde{z}+\phi)d\tilde{x}, \quad (4.28)$$
$$d\hat{y}=\Phi\tilde{x}\cos(\Phi\tilde{z}+\phi)d\tilde{z}+\sin(\Phi\tilde{z}+\phi)d\tilde{x}, \quad (4.29)$$

and so

$$d\hat{S}^2=d\hat{x}^2+d\hat{y}^2+d\hat{z}^2 \quad (4.30)$$
$$=\left(1+\Phi^2\tilde{x}^2\right)d\tilde{z}^2+d\tilde{x}^2, \quad (4.31)$$

so we have (almost) reinvented the parabolic index waveguide; the difference being that only the z-directed index profile is modulated. The resulting anisotropy means that – as is obvious from the transformation used – the structure preserves path lengths and will have no spatial dispersion in the ray limit.

The x,z speed squared matrix for the anisotropic material required for this device design when applied to waves or rays is then

$$\mathfrak{C}^{ij}=c^2\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ 0 & 1+\Phi^2\tilde{x}^2\end{bmatrix}^{-1}. \quad (4.32)$$

Further, we could note that this transformation acts rather like a 2D projection of the helical transformation discussed by McCall et al. [34].

Note that at a given focus point $\tilde{z}_i$, the transformation projects multiple points (actually the entire $\hat{y}$-axis) down to a single point in the device, namely $\tilde{z}=\tilde{z}_i$ and $\tilde{x}=0$. Indeed, the device manifold consists of the $\tilde{x}\tilde{z}$-plane, but with the set of all points consisting of the lines along $\tilde{z}=[(2n+1)\pi/2-\phi]/\Phi$ except when $\tilde{x}=0$ removed. Nevertheless, rays passing through these foci are still distinguishable from each other by their direction. Remarkably, we can also see that the device properties are insensitive to the chosen phase offset ϕ.

V. CONCLUSION

From the perspective given here, there is absolutely nothing "magic" about transformation optics, acoustics, or any of the other transformation domains – as long as we are prepared to tolerate approximations. If we are lucky enough to have a pre-specified metric, e.g. if we want some sort of black hole analog, then we can map this directly to a speed-squared matrix and use our knowledge of materials (or of metamaterials) to work out an implementation. Alternatively, and this is the usual case, if we have a useful scheme for reconfiguring the flow or location of the light or acoustic waves (or rays), then we can simply transform our design ("reference") metric – usually the vacuum, but this is not a requirement – directly into the necessary device metric. This process involves the calculation of only a couple of matrix multiplications at each point in the transformed domain. Then, as before, the demands of any specific implementation are straightforward to identify.

Notably, we can see that if we eschew issues of impedance handling and changes in volume measure the wave and ray transformation procedures to be used are the same. This is not to deny the importance of impedance, merely to note the similarities between transformations of waves and rays. Further, the "obvious" process of matched modulation of both constitutive parameters – e.g. ε and μ in optics, κ and ρ in acoustics – gives the natural choice of impedance mismatch, even if the design intent is only for a ray T-device.

As it stands here, we only consider purely spatial transformations. However, it has already been shown [3, 4, 13] that an extension to spacetime transformations can be done in a relatively straightforward way, at least in the 1+1D case. In contrast, spacetime transforms of dispersive and diffusive systems are more problematic, and is an area we are actively investigating.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge valuable discussions with Robert Thompson, and David Topf; as well as funding from EPSRC grant number EP/K003305/1.

[1] J. B. Pendry, D. Schurig, and D. R. Smith, Science **312**, 1780 (2006), doi:10.1126/science.1125907.
[2] U. Leonhardt, Science **312**, 1777 (2006), doi:10.1126/science.1126493.
[3] M. W. McCall, A. Favaro, P. Kinsler, and A. Boardman, J. Opt. **13**, 024003 (2011), doi:10.1088/2040-8978/13/2/024003.
[4] P. Kinsler and M. W. McCall, Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **526**, 51 (2014), arXiv:1308.3358, doi:10.1002/andp.201300164.
[5] M. Fridman, A. Farsi, Y. Okawachi, and A. L. Gaeta, Nature **481**, 62 (2012), arXiv:1107.2062, doi:10.1038/nature10695.
[6] J. M. Lukens, A. J. Metcalf, D. E. Leaird, and A. M. Weiner, Optica **1**, 372 (2014), doi:10.1364/OPTICA.1.000372.
[7] I. Chremmos, Opt. Lett. **39**, 4611 (2014), doi:10.1364/OL.39.004611.
[8] M. S. A. Jabar, B. A. Bacha, and I. Ahmad, Laser Phys. **25**, 065405 (2015), doi:10.1088/1054-660X/25/6/065405.
[9] S. Zhang, C. Xia, and N. Fang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 024301 (2011), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.024301.
[10] L. Sanchis, V. M. García-Chocano, R. Llopis-Pontiveros, A. Climente, J. Martínez-Pastor, F. Cervera, and J. Sánchez-Dehesa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 124301 (????), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.124301.
[11] S. Guenneau, C. Amra, and D. Veynante, Opt. Express **20**, 8207 (2012), doi:10.1364/OE.20.008207.
[12] R. Schittny, A. Niemeyer, M. Kadic, T. Bückmann, A. Naber, and M. Wegener, Optica **2**, 84 (2015), doi:10.1364/OPTICA.2.000084.
[13] P. Kinsler and M. W. McCall, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 063818 (2014), arXiv:1311.2287, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.89.063818.
[14] P. Kinsler, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 023839 (2009), arXiv:0901.2466, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.79.023839.
[15] P. Kinsler and M. W. McCall, Photon. Nanostruct. Fundam. Appl. **15**, 10 (2015), doi:10.1016/j.photonics.2015.04.005.
[16] M. Sarbort and T. Tyc, J. Opt. **14**, 075705 (2012), doi:10.1088/2040-8978/14/7/075705.
[17] B. F. Schutz, *A first course in general relativity* (Cambridge University Press, 1986), ISBN 0-521-27703-5.
[18] P. Kinsler (2013), arXiv:1309.3427.
[19] C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics* (Wiley, 2004), 8th ed., ISBN 978-0-471-41526-8.
[20] A. N. Norris, Proc. Royal Soc. A **464**, 2411 (2008), doi:10.1098/rspa.2008.0076.
[21] P. Kinsler, J. Tan, T. C. Y. Thio, C. Trant, and N. Kandapper, Eur. J. Phys. **33**, 1737 (2012), arXiv:1206.0003, doi:10.1088/0143-0807/33/6/1737.
[22] R. T. Thompson, S. A. Cummer, and J. Frauendiener, J. Opt. **13**, 024008 (2011), doi:10.1088/2040-8978/13/2/024008.
[23] R. T. Thompson, S. A. Cummer, and J. Frauendiener,

J. Opt. **13**, 055105 (2011), doi:10.1088/2040-8978/13/5/055105.
[24] F. Liu and J. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 103902 (2015), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.103902.
[25] F. Liu, Z. X. Liang, and J. Li, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 033901 (2013), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.033901.
[26] P. Kinsler (2015), draft, "Cloak Imperfect: Impedances".
[27] P. Kinsler (2015), draft, "Cloak Imperfect: Determinants".
[28] R. K. Luneburg, *Mathematical Theory of Optics* (University of California Press, Berkeley, CA, 1964).
[29] S. A. Cummer, R. Liu, and T. J. Cui, J. Appl. Phys. **105**, 056102 (2009), doi:10.1063/1.3080155.
[30] W. Cai, U. K. Chettiar, A. V. Kildishev, V. M. Shalaev, and G. W. Milton, Appl. Phys. Lett. **91**, 111105 (2007), doi:10.1063/1.2783266.
[31] R. C. Mitchell-Thomas, T. M. McManus, O. Quevedo-Teruel, S. A. R. Horsley, and Y. Hao, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 213901 (2013), doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.111.213901.
[32] R. C. Mitchell-Thomas, O. Quevedo-Teruel, T. M. McManus, S. A. R. Horsley, and Y. Hao, Opt. Lett. **39**, 3551 (2014), doi:10.1364/OL.39.003551.
[33] S. A. R. Horsley, I. R. Hooper, R. C. Mitchell-Thomas, and O. Quevedo-Teruel, Sci. Rep. **4**, 4876 (2014), doi:10.1038/srep04876.
[34] M. W. McCall, P. Kinsler, and R. D. M. Topf, J. Opt. (to appear).